

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,975	09/22/2003	Tsuyoshi Tokuda	TOKU3001/EM	4973
23364 BACON & TH	7590 12/20/2006 OMAS PLLC		EXAMINER	
625 SLATERS	LANE		KARLS, SHAY LYNN	
FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1744	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DAYS		12/20/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		TOKUDA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	10/664,975 Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Shay L. Karls	1744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror te, cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. imely filed  In the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 s</u> 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-3, 21, 22, 25, 27-3 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,4-20,23,24 and 26 are subject to reference.	72 is/are withdrawn from consider		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the option of the optio	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicatority documents have been received in Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	4) 🔲 Interview Summan	y (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	Date	

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

In previous office actions dated 5/30/06 and 9/8/06, restrictions requirements were made. With regards to the first species restriction, the applicant elected figures 2 and 9, with traverse on 5/30/06, which read on claims 1, 4-20, 23-24, 26, 27-34 and 72. The applicant's response states that the original disclosure of the present application does not specify that certain shapes only correspond with certain sizes. Rather any shapes can be adopted in combination with any size. While this might be true, the restriction is maintained and the traversal is not found persuasive because as noted in MPEP section 803, "For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be prima facie shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP § 808.02." Since applicant has not rebutted the prima facie shown by appropriate showing or evidence as noted in MPEP 803, except for the argument noted above, applicant's argument is found unpersuasive.

Applicant's election of group 1 (electric blower) in the reply filed on 9/8/06 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 27-34, 72 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 9/8/06.

After further consideration of the remaining claims 1, 4-20, 23-24 and 26 a further restriction is necessary.

Application/Control Number: 10/664,975 Page 3

Art Unit: 1744

#### Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

## Part I: location of outer peripheral end portion of volute chambers is:

- a) substantially identical level to the lower edges of the exhaust openings
- b) located between the lower edges and the upper edges of the exhaust openings.
- c) misaligned with the exhaust openings.

## Part II: total area S1 of exhaust opening is:

- a) less than total cross sectional are S2 of outer peripheral end portions of volute chambers.
- b) equal to or greater than a total cross sectional area S2 of outer peripheral end portions of volute chambers.

### Part III: total area S1 of exhaust opening is:

- a) less than total cross sectional area S3 of air path between air guide and casing.
- b) equal or greater than a total cross sectional area S3 of an air part between the air guide and casing.

# Part IV: total area S1 of exhaust openings is:

a) less than a total cross sectional area S4 of an air path between the electric motor and the bracket enclosing the electric motor.

Ċ

Application/Control Number: 10/664,975

Art Unit: 1744

b) equal to or greater than a total cross sectional area S4 of an air path between the

electric motor and the bracket enclosing the motor.

Part V: total area S1 of exhaust openings is:

a) less than a total area S5 of the outlet opening.

b) equal or greater than a total area S5 of the outlet opening.

The applicant is required to pick one embodiment from each part listed above. The species are

independent or distinct because each invention listed above is directed towards a related electric

blower. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not

capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or

effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the

inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(i). In the instant case, the

inventions as claimed have materially different designs and have different functions or effects.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is

nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for

prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally

held to be allowable. Currently, at least claims 1, 12, 17-20, 23-24, 26 are assumed to be

generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the

species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/664,975

Art Unit: 1744

thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

A telephone call was made to Justin Cassell on 12/15/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the

currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shay L. Karls whose telephone number is 571-272-1268. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-4:30 M-Th, alternating F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Slk

12/15/06